

EXISTENCE AND COMPARISON RESULTS FOR AN ELLIPTIC EQUATION INVOLVING THE 1-LAPLACIAN AND L^1 -DATA

MARTA LATORRE AND SERGIO SEGURA DE LEÓN

ABSTRACT. This paper is devoted to analyse the Dirichlet problem for a non-linear elliptic equation involving the 1-Laplacian and a total variation term, that is, the inhomogeneous case of the equation arising in the level set formulation of the inverse mean curvature flow. We study this problem in an open bounded set with Lipschitz boundary.

We prove an existence result and a comparison principle for non-negative L^1 -data. Moreover, we search the summability that the solution reaches when more regular L^p -data, with $1 < p < N$, are considered and we give evidence that this summability is optimal.

To prove these results, we apply the theory of L^∞ -divergence-measure fields which goes back to Anzellotti (1983). The main difficulties of the proofs come from the absence of a definition for the pairing of a general L^∞ -divergence-measure field and the gradient of an unbounded BV -function.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
Acknowledgements	3
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Functions of bounded variation	4
2.2. L^∞ -divergence-measure fields	5
3. Main results	9
3.1. Existence Theorem	9
3.2. Comparison principle	11
4. Better summability	18
5. Explicit examples	22
References	24

1. INTRODUCTION

Our aim in this paper is to analyze the following Dirichlet problem:

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) + |Du| = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear elliptic equations, L^1 -data, 1-Laplacian operator, Total Variation term, Comparison Principle, Inverse Mean Curvature Flow

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification:* MSC 2010: 35J75, 35J60, 35J25, 35J15 .

where Ω is a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^N with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$ and f is a non-negative function belonging to $L^1(\Omega)$. As usual when the 1-Laplacian operator is considered, the natural energy space to study this problem is $BV(\Omega)$, that is, the space of all functions of bounded variation.

The homogeneous problem, in an unbounded domain, arises in the level set formulation of the inverse mean curvature flow, namely,

$$\boxed{\text{IMCF}} \quad (2) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) + |Du| = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \\ u(x) \rightarrow \infty & \text{as } |x| \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases}$$

The inverse mean curvature flow is a one-parameter family of hypersurfaces $\{\Gamma_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ whose normal velocity $V_n(t)$ at each time t equals the inverse of its mean curvature $H(t)$. Given Γ_0 , the problem is to find $F : \Gamma_0 \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ such that

$$\boxed{\text{elimc}} \quad (3) \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial t} = \frac{\nu}{H}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $\nu(t)$ denotes the unit outward normal to $\Gamma_t = F(\Gamma_0, t)$. The level set formulation (2) was introduced in [13] (see also [14, 21]); observe that $\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right)$ gives the mean curvature and $|Du|$ yields the inverse of the speed. In the case that Ω includes a bounded connected component, it produces a sudden phenomenon called fattening by which this component disappear instantaneously.

If a non-negative source is considered, as in (1), then (3) becomes

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial t} = \frac{\nu}{H + \text{source}} \leq \frac{\nu}{H}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

so that the datum damps the flux. This inhomogeneous inverse mean curvature flow was studied in [18].

Although the homogeneous problem is not interesting in bounded domains because it leads to the trivial solution, this does not occur in the non-homogeneous case since the source can override the fattening phenomenon (at least when f is not very small). Problem (1) in bounded domains has been considered in [17] for data $f \in L^p(\Omega)$, with $p > N$, seeking bounded solutions, and in [16] when data belong to the Marcinkiewicz space $L^{N,\infty}(\Omega)$, looking for unbounded variational solutions. Existence and uniqueness results have been obtained in both papers for any given non-negative datum.

It is worth mentioning that the gradient term is essential to get existence and uniqueness results. In [15] (see also [9, 19] for more general data) it is shown that there exist solutions to problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

only when data are small enough. On the other hand, uniqueness cannot be expected since if u is a solution and g is a real increasing smooth function, then $v = g(u)$ should be a solution as well. Therefore, the total variation term has a regularizing effect.

Our purpose is to go a step further and study problem (1) when data are merely integrable functions. This kind of non-variational problems has extensively been

studied for problems involving the p -Laplacian ($1 < p \leq N$). In this framework, there are two different formulations: that of entropy solution introduced in [4] (see also [5]) and that of renormalized solution, for which we refer to [10]. Both approaches systematically use truncations of solutions. In [2], in the framework of the 1-Laplacian, the authors also introduce a notion of solution by means of truncations. We follow the same concept, but adapted to our situation. Indeed, since the regularizing effect of the total variation yields $u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$, the boundary condition holds in the sense of traces.

Another feature deriving from the regularizing effect is $u \in BV(\Omega)$ without jump part. Nevertheless, this fact does not allow us to define (following Anzellotti, see [3]) the pairing of a general L^∞ -divergence-measure vector field \mathbf{z} and the solution u . Hence, truncations must remain in the definition of solution. Instead of products of the form (\mathbf{z}, Du) , we have to handle with products such as (\mathbf{z}, De^{-u}) and $(e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, Du)$. Beyond these kind of technical complication, the existence theorem holds as it was expected, and we will only make explicit those parts of the proof which are different of that for regular data in [16, Theorem 4.3]. Much more interesting is the comparison principle. We point out that, even in the context of bounded solutions, its proof is new and simpler than that of the uniqueness result in [17]. We also investigate solutions when data belong to $L^p(\Omega)$, with $1 < p < N$, finding that the solution lies in $L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$. Note that Lebesgue spaces continuously adjust with the known cases $p = 1$ (in which $u \in BV(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$) and $p = N$ (see [16, Proposition 4.7]).

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce some definitions and notation and we also give some preliminaries results that we will need. Among these results, we foreground Proposition 2.4 for which we supply a new proof. This proposition is essential to deal with pairings involving functions of the solution (such as truncations) through Proposition 2.7. Section 3 is devoted to prove the existence result and the comparison principle. In section 4 we show the best summability that the solution can get when data belong to $L^p(\Omega)$, with $1 < p < N$. Finally, in the last section we show examples of radial solutions, which give evidence that the obtained regularity is optimal.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has been partially supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad and FEDER, under project MTM2015-70227-P. The first author was also supported by Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad under grant BES-2013-066655.

The authors would like to thank Salvador Moll for some fruitful discussions concerning this paper.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we will introduce some notation and auxiliary results which will be used throughout this paper. In what follows, we will consider $N \geq 2$ and, given a set E , we will write $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(E)$ to denote its $(N-1)$ -dimensional Hausdorff measure and $|E|$ its Lebesgue measure.

In this paper, Ω will always stands for an open subset of \mathbb{R}^N with Lipschitz boundary. Thus, an outward normal unit vector $\nu(x)$ is defined for \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -almost

every $x \in \partial\Omega$. We will make use of the usual Lebesgue and Sobolev spaces, denoted by $L^q(\Omega)$ and $W_0^{1,p}(\Omega)$, respectively (see for instance [6] or [11]).

We recall that for a Radon measure μ in Ω and a Borel set $A \subseteq \Omega$, the measure $\mu \llcorner A$ is defined by $(\mu \llcorner A)(B) = \mu(A \cap B)$ for any Borel set $B \subseteq \Omega$.

The truncation function will be use throughout this paper. Given $k > 0$, it is defined by

$$\boxed{\text{trun}} \quad (4) \quad T_k(s) = \min\{|s|, k\} \operatorname{sign}(s),$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$.

2.1. Functions of bounded variation. The natural energy space to study problems involving the 1-Laplacian is the space of all functions of bounded variation, that is, functions $u : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ belonging to $L^1(\Omega)$ whose derivative in the sense of distributions Du is a Radon measure with finite total variation. This space will be denoted by $BV(\Omega)$.

Let $u \in BV(\Omega)$, we can decompose the Radon measure Du into its absolutely continuous part and its singular part with respect to the Lebesgue measure: $Du = D^a u + D^s u$. We denote by S_u the set of all $x \in \Omega$ which are not Lebesgue points, that is, $x \notin S_u$ if there exists $\tilde{u}(x)$ such that

$$\lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_\rho(x)|} \int_{B_\rho(x)} |u(y) - \tilde{u}(x)| dy = 0.$$

We say that $x \in \Omega$ is an approximate jump point of u , denoted by $x \in J_u$, if there exist two real numbers $u^+(x) > u^-(x)$ and $\nu_u(x)$ with $|\nu_u(x)| = 1$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_\rho^+(x, \nu_u(x))|} \int_{B_\rho^+(x, \nu_u(x))} |u(y) - u^+(x)| dy &= 0, \\ \lim_{\rho \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{|B_\rho^-(x, \nu_u(x))|} \int_{B_\rho^-(x, \nu_u(x))} |u(y) - u^-(x)| dy &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$B_\rho^+(x, \nu_u(x)) = \{y \in B_\rho(x) \mid \langle y - x, \nu_u(x) \rangle > 0\}$$

and

$$B_\rho^-(x, \nu_u(x)) = \{y \in B_\rho(x) \mid \langle y - x, \nu_u(x) \rangle < 0\}.$$

We know that S_u is countably \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -rectifiable and $\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(S_u \setminus J_u) = 0$ by the Federer–Vol’pert Theorem (see [1, Theorem 3.78]). Moreover, we also know

$$Du \llcorner J_u = (u^+ - u^-) \nu_u \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner J_u.$$

Using S_u and J_u , we can split $D^s u$ in its jump part $D^j u$ and its Cantor part $D^c u$, defined by

$$D^j u = D^s u \llcorner J_u \quad \text{and} \quad D^c u = D^s u \llcorner (\Omega \setminus S_u).$$

Then, we have

$$D^j u = (u^+ - u^-) \nu_u \mathcal{H}^{N-1} \llcorner J_u.$$

In addition, if $x \in J_u$, then $\nu_u(x) = \frac{Du}{|Du|}(x)$ where $\frac{Du}{|Du|}$ is the Radon–Nikodým derivative of Du with respect to its total variation $|Du|$.

The precise representative $u^* : \Omega \setminus (S_u \setminus J_u) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of u is defined by

$$u^*(x) = \begin{cases} \tilde{u}(x) & \text{if } x \in \Omega \setminus S_u, \\ \frac{u^-(x) + u^+(x)}{2} & \text{if } x \in J_u. \end{cases}$$

For the sake of simplicity, most of the time we will denote both function and its precise representative by u .

We will use the Chain Rule, but only when u is a bounded variation function without jump part.

Chain-Rule

Proposition 2.1. *Let $u \in BV(\Omega)$ with $D^j u = 0$ and let f be a Lipschitz function in Ω . Then, $v = f \circ u$ belongs to $BV(\Omega)$ and $Dv = f'(u)Du$, so that $D^j v = 0$.*

For further information about bounded variation functions we refer to [1], [12] and [22].

2.2. L^∞ -divergence-measure fields. We will denote by $\mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ the set of all vector fields $\mathbf{z} \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}$ is a Radon measure in Ω with finite total variation. Following [2], we will use these vector fields to give a sense to $\frac{Du}{|Du|}$ in our equation, even if Du is a Radon measure and, moreover, if it vanishes in a zone of the domain. More concretely, we seek for a vector field $\mathbf{z} \in L^\infty(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$ satisfying $\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$ for all $k > 0$.

Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$; for every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ we define the functional

$$\langle (\mathbf{z}, Dw), \varphi \rangle = - \int_{\Omega} w \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} - \int_{\Omega} w \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx.$$

It was proved in [3] that this distribution has order 0 since satisfies

$$|\langle (\mathbf{z}, Dw), \varphi \rangle| \leq \|\varphi\|_\infty \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \int_{\Omega} |Dw|.$$

Thus, it is actually a Radon measure with finite total variation and the following inequality holds

des-An

$$(5) \quad |(\mathbf{z}, Dw)| \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty |Dw|$$

as measures in Ω . In particular, the Radon measure (\mathbf{z}, Dw) is absolutely continuous with respect to $|Dw|$. Denoting by

$$\theta(\mathbf{z}, Dw, \cdot) : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

the Radon-Nikodým derivative of (\mathbf{z}, Dw) with respect to $|Dw|$, it follows that

$$\int_B (\mathbf{z}, Dw) = \int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, Dw, x) |Dw| \quad \text{for all Borel sets } B \subset \Omega,$$

and

$$\|\theta(\mathbf{z}, Dw, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega, |Dw|)} \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty.$$

Moreover, if $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous increasing function, then

Elparing12

$$(6) \quad \theta(\mathbf{z}, D(f \circ w), x) = \theta(\mathbf{z}, Dw, x) \quad |Dw|-\text{a.e. in } \Omega.$$

The Anzellotti theory also provides the definition of a weak trace on $\partial\Omega$ to the normal component of any vector field $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty$, denoted by $[z, \nu]$. This weak trace satisfies $\|[z, \nu]\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty$. Relating the pairing (\mathbf{z}, Dw) and the weak trace $[z, \nu]$ a Green's formula holds.

Green

Theorem 2.2. *If $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty$ and $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, then we have*

$$\int_{\Omega} w \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} + \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{z}, Dw) = \int_{\partial\Omega} w [z, \nu] \, d\mathcal{H}^{N-1}.$$

As mentioned, for a general $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$, Anzellotti's theory assumes that $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap C(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ in order to define (\mathbf{z}, Dw) and to prove a Green's formula. This theory was generalized to consider $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ in [8] using a different approach, and in [7] and [20] following the same definitions of Anzellotti. Indeed, given $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $w \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$; for every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ we may define the functional

$$\langle (\mathbf{z}, Dw), \varphi \rangle = - \int_{\Omega} w^* \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} - \int_{\Omega} w \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx.$$

We explicitly mention that the precise representative w^* is summable with respect to $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}$ and that this definition depends on the chosen representative of the function.

Now, we present some results which we use several times in the sequel. Next proposition was proved in [17].

Prop2.3

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and let $u, w \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ be functions such that $D^j u = D^j w = 0$. Then*

$$(w \mathbf{z}, Du) = w^*(\mathbf{z}, Du) \quad \text{as Radon measures in } \Omega.$$

In principle, it is not clear that (6) holds in the case that $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. However, we will see that (6) holds if we assume the jump part $D^j u$ vanishes. This result was proved in [17] but an extra hypothesis is needed in the proof, namely, the set of discontinuities of u is \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -null. We next prove this result under the general assumption $D^j u = 0$. Following Anzellotti, the main ingredient to prove the above formula is a “slicing” result that links the measure (\mathbf{z}, Du) with the measures $(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})$, where $E_{u,t} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > t\}$.

rebanada

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and consider $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $D^j u = 0$. Let $E_{u,t} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > t\}$. Then for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, the function $t \mapsto \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \varphi \rangle$ is \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable and*

e2mejora

$$(7) \quad \langle (\mathbf{z}, Du), \varphi \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \varphi \rangle \, dt.$$

Proof. First we observe that we may assume $u \geq 0$; if not, we consider the function $u + \|u\|_\infty$.

We also point out that for every measurable set $E \subset \Omega$ having finite perimeter, the condition $|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}|(\partial^* E) = 0$ implies

$$\chi_E \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} = \chi_E^* \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}.$$

As a consequence, we obtain the following claim:

If $E \subset \Omega$ is a measurable set with finite perimeter such that $|\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}|(\partial^ E) = 0$, then*

$$\langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_E), \varphi \rangle = - \int_E \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} - \int_E \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$.

In what follows, recall that u stands for the precise representative of the BV -function. Observe that, thanks to the coarea formula, the level sets $E_{u,t}$ have finite perimeter for \mathcal{L}^1 -almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, since $D^j u = 0$, it follows that

$$\mathcal{H}^{N-1}(\partial^* E_{u,t} \cap \partial^* E_{u,s}) = 0 \quad \text{for } s \neq t.$$

Then, applying $|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{z})| \ll \mathcal{H}^{N-1}$ (by [8, Proposition 3.1]), we have

$$|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{z})|(\partial^* E_{u,t} \cap \partial^* E_{u,s}) = 0 \quad \text{if } s \neq t.$$

Therefore, there exists $A \subset \mathbb{R}$ numerable such that

$$|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{z})|(\partial^* E_{u,t}) = 0 \quad \text{if } t \in \mathbb{R} \setminus A.$$

In other words, we have seen that $|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{z})|(\partial^* E_{u,t}) = 0$ for \mathcal{L}^1 -almost all $t > 0$. Thus, our claim implies that if $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, then

$$\boxed{\text{ec:1}} \quad (8) \quad \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \varphi \rangle = - \int_{E_{u,t}} \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} - \int_{E_{u,t}} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx, \quad \text{for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-almost all } t > 0.$$

Considering $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, we apply the slicing formula for integrable functions (see, for instance, [22, Lemma 1.5.1]) and (8) to get that the function

$$t \mapsto - \int_{E_{u,t}} \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} \, dt - \int_{E_{u,t}} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx$$

is \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable and

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\mathbf{z}, Du), \varphi \rangle &= - \int_{\Omega} u^* \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} - \int_{\Omega} u \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \\ &= \int_0^\infty \left[- \int_{E_{u,t}} \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} \, dt - \int_{E_{u,t}} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \right] dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \varphi \rangle \, dt, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

rebanada1 **Proposition 2.5.** *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and consider $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $D^j u = 0$. Let $E_{u,t} := \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > t\}$. Then for all Borel set $B \subset \Omega$, the function $t \mapsto \int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})$ is \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable and*

$$\boxed{\text{e3mejora}} \quad (9) \quad \int_B (\mathbf{z}, Du) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \left[\int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}) \right] dt.$$

Proof. Let S denote a countable set in $C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ which is dense with respect to the uniform convergence. Then, for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $E_{u,t}$ has finite perimeter and for every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\varphi \geq 0$, it yields

$$\langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+, \varphi \rangle = \sup\{\langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \psi \rangle : \psi \in S, 0 \leq \psi \leq \varphi\}.$$

Thus the positive part of the measure $t \mapsto \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+, \varphi \rangle$ defines a \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable function since it is the supremum of a countable quantity of \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable functions. Recalling the Riesz Representation Theorem, we may go further considering an open set $B \subset \Omega$: it follows from

$$\int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+ = \sup\{\langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+, \psi \rangle : \psi \in S, 0 \leq \psi \leq \chi_B\},$$

that $t \mapsto \int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+$ defines a \mathcal{L}^1 -measurable function. The regularity of the measures lead to the same conclusion for an arbitrary Borel set. This function is \mathcal{L}^1 -summable since

$$\int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^+ \leq \int_B |(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})| \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \int_B |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}|,$$

for \mathcal{L}^1 -almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, and $t \mapsto \int_B |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}|$ defines an \mathcal{L}^1 -summable function, due to the coarea formula.

On the other hand, a similar argument can be done for the negative part of the measures $(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})$, so that $t \mapsto \int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})^-$ defines an \mathcal{L}^1 -summable function for every Borel set $B \subset \Omega$. As a consequence, $t \mapsto \int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}})$ defines an \mathcal{L}^1 -summable function for every Borel set $B \subset \Omega$.

Finally, consider a distribution μ defined by

$$\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle = \langle (\mathbf{z}, Du), \varphi \rangle - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}), \varphi \rangle dt.$$

Proposition 2.4 implies that $\langle \mu, \varphi \rangle = 0$ for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, wherewith μ is a Radon measure which vanishes identically. Therefore, (9) holds true. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and consider $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $D^j u = 0$. Then*

eimejora

$$(10) \quad \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) = \theta(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}, x) \quad |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| \text{-a.e. in } \Omega \text{ for } \mathcal{L}^1\text{-almost all } t \in \mathbb{R},$$

Proof. Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, with $a < b$ and let $B \subset \Omega$ be a Borel set. Applying (9) to the set $\{x \in \Omega : a \leq u(x) \leq b\} \cap B$, we obtain

basic

$$(11) \quad \int_{\{a \leq u \leq b\} \cap B} (\mathbf{z}, Du) = \int_a^b \left[\int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}) \right] dt.$$

Now we are analyzing both sides of (11). On the one hand, the coarea formula implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\{a \leq u \leq b\} \cap B} (\mathbf{z}, Du) &= \int_{\{a \leq u \leq b\} \cap B} \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |Du| \\ &= \int_a^b \left[\int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| \right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

On the other,

$$\int_a^b \left[\int_B (\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}) \right] dt = \int_a^b \left[\int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| \right] dt.$$

Hence (11) becomes

$$\int_a^b \left[\int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| \right] dt = \int_a^b \left[\int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| \right] dt.$$

It follows that, for \mathcal{L}^1 -almost all $t \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}| = \int_B \theta(\mathbf{z}, D\chi_{E_{u,t}}, x) |D\chi_{E_{u,t}}|$$

holds for every Borel set B . The desired equality (10) is proved. \square

Prop2.2

Proposition 2.7. *Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and consider $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ with $D^j u = 0$. If $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous non-decreasing function, then*

E1paring1200

$$(12) \quad \theta(\mathbf{z}, D(f \circ u), x) = \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) \quad |D(f \circ u)| \text{-a.e. in } \Omega.$$

Proof. We may follow Anzellotti (see [3, Proposition 2.8]) for the case of a increasing function. For the general case, consider f non-decreasing and let $\epsilon > 0$. Since the function given by $t \mapsto f(t) + \epsilon t$ is increasing, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{z}, D(f \circ u)) + \epsilon(\mathbf{z}, Du) &= (\mathbf{z}, D((f \circ u) + \epsilon u)) \\ &= \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |D((f \circ u) + \epsilon u)| = \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) (f'(u) + \epsilon) |Du| \end{aligned}$$

as measures in Ω . Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we deduce

$$(\mathbf{z}, D(f \circ u)) = \theta(\mathbf{z}, Du, x) |D(f \circ u)| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega.$$

Therefore, we have seen that (12) holds. \square

3. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we prove our main results, namely the existence theorem and the comparison principle. We begin by stating our concept of solution to problem (1). The first difficulty we have to deal with is that we are not able to define the distribution (\mathbf{z}, Du) when data are just integrable functions. Following [2], we will solve this problem introducing truncations in the concept of solution used in [16].

def-sol

Definition 3.1. *We say that $u \in BV(\Omega)$ is a solution to problem (1) if $D^j u = 0$ and there exists a vector field $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1$ such that*

cond-distribucion

$$(13) \quad -\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} + |Du| = f \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

cond-medida

$$(14) \quad (\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)| \quad \text{as measures in } \Omega \quad (\text{for every } k > 0),$$

and

cond-frontera

$$(15) \quad u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

3.1. Existence Theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Let Ω be an open and bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^N with Lipschitz boundary and let f be a non-negative function in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, problem (1) has at least one solution.*

Proof. The same proof of [16, Theorem 4.3] works with minor modifications. Nevertheless, some remarks are in order.

The first remark is concerning the pairing $(e^{-u} \mathbf{z}, Du)$. If u is integrable with respect to the measure $\operatorname{div}(e^{-u} \mathbf{z})$ and $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, then the integrals

$$\int_{\Omega} \varphi u \operatorname{div}(e^{-u} \mathbf{z}) \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega} u e^{-u} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx$$

are both finite; notice that the second integral is bounded due to the inequality $u e^{-u} \leq e^{-1}$. Therefore,

$$\langle (e^{-u} \mathbf{z}, Du), \varphi \rangle = - \int_{\Omega} \varphi u \operatorname{div}(e^{-u} \mathbf{z}) - \int_{\Omega} u e^{-u} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx$$

is a well-defined distribution (although the distribution (\mathbf{z}, Du) is not). Moreover, we may apply the Anzellotti procedure and obtain a Radon measure.

Taking this fact in mind, we may follow the proof of [16, Theorem 4.3]. Starting from suitable approximating problems, we get a limit of the approximate solutions

$u \in BV(\Omega)$ such that $D^j u = 0$. In addition, we also get a vector field $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover, the equation (13) holds and

$$-\operatorname{div}(e^{-u}\mathbf{z}) = e^{-u}f.$$

This last equality implies that u is integrable with respect to the measure $\operatorname{div}(e^{-u}\mathbf{z})$ and so $(e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, Du)$ is a Radon measure.

Two conditions of Definition 3.1 must still be proved, namely, (14) and (15). We begin by seeing

$$\boxed{\text{medidas-T}_k} \quad (16) \quad (\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)| \text{ as measures in } \Omega$$

for every $k > 0$.

To see (16) we start with the following equality as measures (proved in [16, Theorem 4.3]):

$$\boxed{\text{des-previa}} \quad (17) \quad |De^{-u}| \leq (e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, Du).$$

First, we will show

$$|De^{-T_k(u)}| \leq (e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)).$$

On the one hand, considering the restriction to the set $\{u \geq k\}$ we have

$$|De^{-T_k(u)}| \llcorner \{u \geq k\} = e^{-T_k(u)} |DT_k(u)| \llcorner \{u \geq k\} = 0,$$

and on the other hand

$$|(e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u))| \llcorner \{u \geq k\} \leq |DT_k(u)| \llcorner \{u \geq k\} = 0.$$

Now, we just work with the restriction to the set $\{u < k\}$. For every $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\varphi \geq 0$, using the definition of the distribution and applying (17) we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) \llcorner \{u < k\}, \varphi \rangle &= - \int_{\{u < k\}} \varphi u \operatorname{div}(e^{-u}\mathbf{z}) - \int_{\{u < k\}} u e^{-u}\mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx \\ &= \langle (e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, Du) \llcorner \{u < k\}, \varphi \rangle \geq \int_{\{u < k\}} \varphi |De^{-u}| \\ &= \int_{\Omega} \varphi e^{-u} |DT_k(u)| = \int_{\Omega} \varphi |De^{-T_k(u)}|. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we have to prove that $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$ as measures in Ω . We use Proposition 2.3 and the Chain Rule to get

$$|De^{-T_k(u)}| \leq (e^{-u}\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = e^{-u}(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) \leq e^{-u}|DT_k(u)| = |De^{-T_k(u)}|.$$

Then, the inequality becomes equality and $e^{-u}(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = e^{-u}|DT_k(u)|$ as measures in Ω . We deduce that

$$(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$$

as measures in Ω , since $e^{-u} = 0$ yields $T_k(u) = k$ for every $k > 0$.

To check the boundary condition (15) we consider the real function defined by

$$J_1(s) = \int_0^s T_1(\sigma) \, d\sigma.$$

Then, in the same way than in [16, Theorem 4.3], we obtain

$$\boxed{\text{des-front}} \quad (18) \quad \int_{\Omega} |DT_1(u)| + \int_{\partial\Omega} |T_1(u)| d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} |DJ_1(u)| + \int_{\partial\Omega} |J_1(u)| d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq \int_{\Omega} f T_1(u) dx.$$

Using the equation and the previous step, and applying the Green's formula and the Chain Rule, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} f T_1(u) dx &= - \int_{\Omega} T_1(u) \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} + \int_{\Omega} T_1(u) |Du| \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{z}, DT_1(u)) - \int_{\partial\Omega} T_1(u) [\mathbf{z}, \nu] d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} |DJ_1(u)| \\ &= \int_{\Omega} |DT_1(u)| - \int_{\partial\Omega} T_1(u) [\mathbf{z}, \nu] d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\Omega} |DJ_1(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

Going back to (18) and simplifying, it follows that

$$\int_{\partial\Omega} |T_1(u)| + T_1(u) [\mathbf{z}, \nu] d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} + \int_{\partial\Omega} |J_1(u)| d\mathcal{H}^{N-1} \leq 0.$$

Observe that both integrals are non-negative, so that both vanish. In particular, $J_1(u) = 0$ \mathcal{H}^{N-1} -a.e. on $\partial\Omega$. Therefore, the boundary condition holds true. \square

3.2. Comparison principle. Before proving the comparison principle we need to present some preliminary results.

$\boxed{\text{prop-medidas}}$

Proposition 3.3. *Let \mathbf{z} be a vector field in $\mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ and let u be a function of bounded variation with $D^j u = 0$ and such that $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$ for every $k > 0$. If $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a bounded, increasing and Lipschitz function, then $(\mathbf{z}, Dg(u)) = |Dg(u)|$ holds as measures.*

Proof. Since $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$, the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u))$ with respect its total variation $|DT_k(u)|$ is $\theta(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u), x) = 1$. Moreover, using Proposition 2.7 we get

$$\theta(\mathbf{z}, Dg(T_k(u)), x) = \theta(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u), x) = 1,$$

that is, $(\mathbf{z}, Dg(T_k(u))) = |Dg(T_k(u))|$ for every $k > 0$. Now, by the Dominated Convergence Theorem, we take limits in this expression when k goes to ∞ and it leads to

$$(\mathbf{z}, Dg(u)) = g'(u) |Du| = |Dg(u)|.$$

\square

$\boxed{\text{prop-1}}$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $f \in L^1(\Omega)$. If $u \in BV(\Omega)$ is a solution to problem (1) and $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ is the associated vector field, then the following equality holds:*

$$-\operatorname{div}(e^{-u} \mathbf{z}) = e^{-u} f \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$, we take the test function $e^{-u} \varphi$ in problem (1) and we obtain

$$- \int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \varphi \operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} + \int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \varphi |Du| = \int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \varphi f dx.$$

Now, since e^{-u} is bounded, we can use the definition of pairing (\mathbf{z}, De^{-u}) and the former equality becomes

$$\int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \mathbf{z} \cdot \nabla \varphi \, dx + \int_{\Omega} \varphi (\mathbf{z}, De^{-u}) + \int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \varphi |Du| = \int_{\Omega} e^{-u} \varphi f \, dx.$$

Finally, using $(\mathbf{z}, De^{-u}) = -e^{-u}|Du|$ (see Proposition 3.3) and Green's formula we deduce

$$-\operatorname{div}(e^{-u} \mathbf{z}) = e^{-u} f \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega).$$

□

Theorem 3.5. *Let f_1 and f_2 be two non-negative functions in $L^1(\Omega)$ with $f_1 \leq f_2$, and consider problems*

$$\boxed{\text{prob-u1}} \quad (19) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du_1}{|Du_1|} \right) + |Du_1| = f_1(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_1 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{prob-u2}} \quad (20) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du_2}{|Du_2|} \right) + |Du_2| = f_2(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u_2 = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases}$$

If u_1 is a solution to problem (19) and u_2 is a solution to problem (20), then $u_1 \leq u_2$.

Proof. For each $i = 1, 2$, we know that solution $u_i \in BV(\Omega)$ satisfies $D^j u_i = 0$ and there exists a vector field $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ such that $\|\mathbf{z}_i\|_\infty \leq 1$. Moreover,

$$-\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}_i + |Du_i| = f_i \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

$$(\mathbf{z}_i, DT_k(u_i)) = |DT_k(u_i)| \text{ as measures in } \Omega \text{ (for every } k > 0),$$

and

$$u_i|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

We are seeking that $u_1 \leq u_2$, to this end we divide the proof in several steps.

STEP 1: $(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{D}(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+)$ is a positive Radon measure for all $k > 0$.

Let $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\varphi \geq 0$. Then, the measure $(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+)$ actually is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} \varphi (\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} \varphi (\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))) \\ &= \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} \varphi \left[(z_1, DT_k(u_1)) - (z_2, DT_k(u_1)) - (z_1, DT_k(u_2)) + (z_2, DT_k(u_2)) \right] \\ &= \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} \varphi \left[|DT_k(u_1)| - (z_2, DT_k(u_1)) - (z_1, DT_k(u_2)) + |DT_k(u_2)| \right] \\ &\geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $(z_i, Du_j) \leq |Du_j|$ for $i, j = 1, 2$.

Therefore, we conclude that $(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+)$ is a positive Radon measure.

STEP 2: Prove that $\int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})(|Du_1| - |Du_2|) \geq 0$.

First, we take the test function $(e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+$ in problem (19) and since $(e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+ \neq 0$ if $u_1 > u_2$, we get

$$\boxed{\text{ec-u1}} \quad (21) \quad \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})) + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) |Du_1| \\ = \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+ f_1 \, dx.$$

Moreover, using that $e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1} = (1 - e^{-u_1}) - (1 - e^{-u_2})$ we also have

$$\boxed{\text{ec2-u1}} \quad (22) \quad \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+ f_1 \, dx = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_1})) - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_2})) \\ + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_1| - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_1| \\ = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |D(1 - e^{-u_1})| - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_2})) \\ + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_1| - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_1| \\ = - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_2})) + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_1|,$$

where we have used Proposition 2.7 and the Chain Rule.

Now, taking the same test function $(e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+$ in problem (20) and making similar computations we obtain

$$\boxed{\text{ec2-u2}} \quad (23) \quad \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1})^+ f_2 \, dx = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_2, D(1 - e^{-u_1})) - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_2|.$$

Since $f_1 \leq f_2$, we can join expressions (22) and (23) to get the following inequality:

$$\int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_2| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_1| \\ \leq \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_2})) + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (\mathbf{z}_2, D(1 - e^{-u_1})) \\ \leq \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |(\mathbf{z}_1, D(1 - e^{-u_2}))| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |(\mathbf{z}_2, D(1 - e^{-u_1}))| \\ \leq \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |D(1 - e^{-u_2})| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |D(1 - e^{-u_1})| \\ = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_2| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_1|,$$

where we have used that $\|\mathbf{z}_i\| \leq 1$ for $i = 1, 2$ and the Chain Rule.

In conclusion, we have just proved

$$\int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_2| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_1| - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} |Du_2| - \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_2} |Du_1| \leq 0,$$

and we are done.

STEP 3: The Radon measure $(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{D}(T_k(\mathbf{u}_1) - T_k(\mathbf{u}_2)))^+$ vanishes for all $k > 0$.

Since u_1 is a solution to problem (19) and u_2 is a solution to problem (20), the following equalities hold in $\mathcal{D}'(\Omega)$ (see Proposition 3.4):

$$\boxed{\text{dis-u1}} \quad (24) \quad -\operatorname{div}(e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1) = e^{-u_1} f_1$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{dis-u2}} \quad (25) \quad -\operatorname{div}(e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2) = e^{-u_2} f_2.$$

Firstly, let $k > 0$ we choose the test function $(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+$ in equality (24). Applying Green's formula we get

$$\boxed{\text{dis2-u1}} \quad (26) \quad \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) = \int_{\Omega} (T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+ e^{-u_1} f_1 dx,$$

and using the same test function but now in equality (25) we have

$$\boxed{\text{dis2-u2}} \quad (27) \quad \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) = \int_{\Omega} (T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+ e^{-u_2} f_2 dx.$$

Now, we put together (26) and (27) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \boxed{\text{ec-2}} \quad (28) \quad & \int_{\Omega} (T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+ (e^{-u_1} f_1 - e^{-u_2} f_2) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1 - e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) \\ &= \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2 - e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1, D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1))). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the integral on the left hand side is non-positive since $e^{-u_1} f_1 - e^{-u_2} f_2 \leq 0$ where $T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2) > 0$. Our aim is to prove the following limit:

$$\boxed{\text{limite}} \quad (29) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1 - e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) = 0,$$

which is non-positive because of (28). To this end, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2 - e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1, D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1))) \\ &= \underbrace{\int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} ((e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1)))}_{\text{(I.1)}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (e^{-u_1} (\mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{z}_1), D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1)))}_{\text{(I.2)}}, \end{aligned}$$

and will see that the limits as k goes to ∞ of (I.1) and of (I.2) are non-negative and so (29) holds.

On the one hand, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} ((e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1))) \\ & \geq \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) \chi_{\{u_2 < k\}} |Du_2| - \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) \chi_{\{u_1 < k\}} |Du_1|, \end{aligned}$$

and when we take limits when k goes to ∞ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} ((e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_2) - T_k(u_1))) \\ = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (e^{-u_2} - e^{-u_1}) (|Du_2| - |Du_1|) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is non-negative due to Step 2.

On the other hand, we already know that integral (I.2) is non-negative (because of Step 1), therefore the limit when $k \rightarrow \infty$ is non-negative too.

In short, we have proved

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) (e^{-u_1} f_1 - e^{-u_2} f_2) dx \\ = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_1} \mathbf{z}_1 - e^{-u_2} \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)))^+ = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, since (28)=(I.1)+(I.2) and the limits of integral (I.1) and (I.2) are both non-negative, it follows that both limits vanish.

Now, some remarks on Radon–Nikodým derivatives of these measures are in order. Let $\theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x)$ be the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1))$ with respect to $|DT_k(u_1)|$:

$$\theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x) |DT_k(u_1)| = (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1)).$$

Since $|(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1))| \leq |DT_k(u_1)|$, it follows that $|\theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x)| \leq 1$. We point out that this function is $|DT_k(u_1)|$ -measurable and, taking $\theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x) = 0$ in $\{u_1 \geq k\}$, it is $|Du_1|$ -measurable.

On the other hand, it holds that $(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_{k+1}(u_1)) \ll \{u_1 < k\} = (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1))$. Therefore

$$\theta_{k+1}^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_{k+1}(u_1), x) \chi_{\{u_1 < k\}}(x) = \theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x),$$

and $\theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x)$ defines a non-decreasing sequence of $|Du_1|$ -measurable functions.

Likewise, if we denote by $\theta_k^2(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2), x)$ the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2))$ with respect to $|DT_k(u_2)|$, then we may deduce the inequality $|\theta_k^2(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2), x)| \leq 1$. Moreover, $\theta_k^2(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2), x)$ defines a non-decreasing sequence of $|Du_2|$ -measurable functions.

Now, we define the functions $\theta^1(x)$ and $\theta^2(x)$ such that

$$\theta^1(x) = \theta_k^1(\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1), x) \quad \text{if} \quad u_1(x) < k,$$

and

$$\theta^2(x) = \theta_k^2(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2), x) \quad \text{if} \quad u_2(x) < k.$$

We know that θ^1 and θ^2 are $|Du_1|$ and $|Du_2|$ -measurable, respectively, and satisfy $|\theta^1| \leq 1$ and $|\theta^2| \leq 1$.

So let us get back to expression (I.2). We know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\Omega} (e^{-u_1}(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2), D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) \\ &= \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} e^{-u_1} \left[(\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_1)) - (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1)) - (\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2)) + (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_2)) \right] \\ &= \int_{\Omega} e^{-u_1} \chi_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} \cap \{u_1 < k\}} (1 - \theta^1(x)) |Du_1| \\ &\quad + \int_{\Omega} e^{-u_1} \chi_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} \cap \{u_2 < k\}} (1 - \theta^2(x)) |Du_2|, \end{aligned}$$

and using the Convergence Dominated Theorem we can take limit when $k \rightarrow \infty$ to arrive at

$$0 = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} (1 - \theta^1(x)) |Du_1| + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} (1 - \theta^2(x)) |Du_2|.$$

Since both integrals are non-negative, it yields

$$0 = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} (1 - \theta^1(x)) |Du_1| = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} e^{-u_1} (1 - \theta^2(x)) |Du_2|.$$

Therefore, we deduce that $1 - \theta^i(x) = 0$ $|Du_i|$ -a.e. in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and then, the Radon–Nikodým derivative is $\theta_k^i = 1$ $|Du_i|$ -a.e. in $\{u_1 > u_2\} \cap \{u_i < k\}$ with $i = 1, 2$ for every $k > 0$. That is, we have the following equalities as measures:

$$\boxed{\text{med-1}} \quad (30) \quad |DT_k(u_1)| \llcorner \{u_1 > u_2\} = (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1)) \llcorner \{u_1 > u_2\},$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{med-2}} \quad (31) \quad |DT_k(u_2)| \llcorner \{u_1 > u_2\} = (\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2)) \llcorner \{u_1 > u_2\}.$$

Finally, noting that $\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} \subseteq \{u_1 > u_2\}$ and the measure $(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+)$ is non-negative:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+) \\ &= \left[|DT_k(u_1)| - (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1)) - (\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2)) + |DT_k(u_2)| \right] \llcorner \{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} \\ &\leq \left[|DT_k(u_1)| - (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_k(u_1)) - (\mathbf{z}_1, DT_k(u_2)) + |DT_k(u_2)| \right] \llcorner \{u_1 > u_2\} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

STEP 4: $(\mathbf{z}_i, DT_k(\mathbf{u}_j)) \llcorner \{\mathbf{T}_k(\mathbf{u}_1) > \mathbf{T}_k(\mathbf{u}_2)\} = |DT_k(\mathbf{u}_j)| \llcorner \{\mathbf{T}_k(\mathbf{u}_1) > \mathbf{T}_k(\mathbf{u}_2)\}$ as measures for $i, j = 1, 2$ and $k > 0$.

Since $\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} \subseteq \{u_1 > u_2\}$ and we have proved equalities (30) and (31), Step 4 is straightforward.

STEP 5: If $\mathbf{u}_1 > \mathbf{u}_2$, then $\mathbf{f}_1 = \mathbf{f}_2 = 0$.

In Step 3 we have proved that the limit of expression (28) when k goes to ∞ is 0. Then, using the Monotone Convergence Theorem, we get

$$0 = \int_{\Omega} (u_1 - u_2)^+ (e^{-u_1} f_1 - e^{-u_2} f_2) dx.$$

Notice that if $u_1 > u_2$, then $e^{-u_1} f_1 = e^{-u_2} f_2$ and $f_1 = e^{-(u_2-u_1)} f_2 > f_2$ when $f_2 \neq 0$. We conclude that $u_1 > u_2$ implies $f_2 = f_1 = 0$.

STEP 6: Prove that $\int_{\{\mathbf{u}_1 > \mathbf{u}_2\}} |\mathbf{Du}_1| = \int_{\{\mathbf{u}_1 > \mathbf{u}_2\}} |\mathbf{Du}_2|$.

Firstly, we take $T_\varepsilon((T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+)$ as a test function in problems (19) and (20) and using the previous step we get the following equalities:

$$\boxed{\text{ec3-u1}} \quad (32) \quad 0 = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (\mathbf{z}_1, DT_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))) \\ + \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} T_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) |Du_1|,$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{ec3-u2}} \quad (33) \quad 0 = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (\mathbf{z}_2, DT_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))) \\ + \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} T_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) |Du_2|.$$

Now, we use Step 3 to have:

$$(\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2, D(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))) \mathbf{L}\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\} = 0.$$

Furthermore, when we take the restriction to the set $\{0 < T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2) < \varepsilon\}$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, we also get that the measure vanishes. Due to this fact, when we consider together equations (32) and (33), we obtain

$$\int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} T_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) |Du_1| \\ = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} T_\varepsilon(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) |Du_2|.$$

Now, dividing both integrals by ε and using the Dominated Convergence Theorem we can take limits as ε goes to 0 and then we get

$$\int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} |Du_1| = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} |Du_2|.$$

Finally, the Dominated Convergence Theorem also allows us to take limits as $k \rightarrow \infty$ and so we arrive at

$$\boxed{\text{ec-3}} \quad (34) \quad \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |Du_1| = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |Du_2|.$$

STEP 7: Prove $\mathbf{Du}_1 = \mathbf{Du}_2 = \mathbf{0}$ in $\{\mathbf{u}_1 > \mathbf{u}_2\}$.

We begin taking the test function $(T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2))^+$ in problem (19) and having in mind Step 4 and Step 5, we get:

$$\boxed{\text{ec-4}} \quad (35) \quad 0 = \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} |DT_k(u_1)| - \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} |DT_k(u_2)| \\ + \int_{\{T_k(u_1) > T_k(u_2)\}} (T_k(u_1) - T_k(u_2)) |Du_1|.$$

Now, the first two integrals are convergent as $k \rightarrow \infty$ due to the Dominated Convergence Theorem and the last one converges by the Monotone Convergence Theorem. Hence, when k goes to ∞ in (35) we get

$$0 = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (|Du_1| - |Du_2|) + \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (u_1 - u_2) |Du_1|,$$

and since the first integral is finite, the last one is finite too.

On the other hand, we have proved in Step 6 that the first integral vanishes, then the above equality becomes

$$0 = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} (u_1 - u_2) |Du_1|,$$

and we deduce that $|Du_1| \mathbf{1}_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} = 0$ and also $Du_1 = 0$ in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$.

To prove that $Du_2 = 0$ in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$ we use (34) and since we already know that $Du_1 = 0$ in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$, it becomes

$$0 = \int_{\{u_1 > u_2\}} |Du_2|.$$

Therefore we have that $Du_2 = 0$ in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$.

STEP 8: $u_1 \leq u_2$ in Ω .

We have seen that $D(u_1 - u_2) = 0$ in $\{u_1 > u_2\}$ and since $D^j(u_1 - u_2) = 0$, it holds that $D(u_1 - u_2)^+ = 0$ in Ω . Moreover, we know that $(u_1 - u_2)^+ = 0$ in $\partial\Omega$, therefore we get that $0 = (u_1 - u_2)^+$ in Ω . \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let Ω be a bounded open subset of \mathbb{R}^N with Lipschitz boundary. Let f be a non-negative function in $L^1(\Omega)$. Then, problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) + |Du| = f(x) & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

has a unique solution $u \in BV(\Omega)$.

4. BETTER SUMMABILITY

In Section 3 we have seen that problem (1) has a solution for every non-negative datum of $L^1(\Omega)$, and this solution belongs to $BV(\Omega) \subset L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$. We expect that the solution satisfies a better summability if the datum belongs to $L^p(\Omega)$, $p > 1$. In this regard we recall that, when data f are in the space $L^p(\Omega)$ with $p > N$, it is proved in [17] that the solution is always bounded. For datum $f \in L^N(\Omega)$, we proved in [16] that the solution belongs to $L^q(\Omega)$ with $1 < q < \infty$.

In this section, we are showing that solutions belong to $L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ if data are in $L^p(\Omega)$ with $1 < p < N$. Observe that this result adjust continuously for $p = 1$ and $p = N$ with the known facts.

Data	Solution
$f \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $p > N$	$u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$
$f \in L^N(\Omega)$	$u \in L^q(\Omega)$ with $1 \leq q < \infty$
$f \in L^p(\Omega)$ with $1 < p < N$	$u \in L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$
$f \in L^1(\Omega)$	$u \in L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$

The proof of our theorem relies on certain preliminary results. The first one enable us to take a power of our solution u^q as a test function in problem (1).

proposition-1

Proposition 4.1. *If $u \in BV(\Omega)$ is a solution to problem (1) satisfying $u^q \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ for certain $q > 1$, then u^q and $u^{q+1} \in BV(\Omega)$. Moreover,*

ec-prop

$$(36) \quad \int_{\Omega} |Du^q| + \int_{\Omega} u^q |Du| = \int_{\Omega} u^q f.$$

Proof. Fixed $k > 0$, we define the function $G_k(s) = s - T_k(s)$, and we take the test function $G_\delta(T_k(u)^q)$ with $\delta, k > 0$ in problem (1) obtaining the following equality:

$$\int_{\Omega} (\mathbf{z}, DG_\delta(T_k(u)^q)) + \int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) |Du| = \int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) f dx.$$

Since we know that the Radon–Nikodým derivative of $(\mathbf{z}, DG_\delta(T_k(u)^q))$ and $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u))$ with respect their respective total variations are the same (Proposition 2.7) and $(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)|$ holds for all $k > 0$, we deduce that

$$(\mathbf{z}, G_\delta(T_k(u)^q)) = |DG_\delta((T_k(u)^q))|.$$

Then we can write:

lim-ademas

$$(37) \quad \int_{\Omega} |DG_\delta(T_k(u)^q)| + \int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) |Du| = \int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) f dx.$$

Now, we use the inequality $G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) \leq u^q$ and Hölder's inequality to get the following bound:

$$\int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) f dx \leq \int_{\Omega} u^q f dx \leq \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty.$$

Therefore, each integral in left hand side of (37) is also bounded:

BV-q

$$(38) \quad \int_{\Omega} |DG_\delta(T_k(u)^q)| \leq \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty,$$

and

BV-q+1

$$(39) \quad \int_{\Omega} G_\delta(T_k(u)^q) |Du| \leq \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty.$$

We will take advantage of these bounds to take limits in (37).

Now, we are able to prove $u^q \in BV(\Omega)$. Using the Chain Rule in (38) we can write the following inequalities

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < k\} \cap \{u^q > \delta\}} |Du^q| = \int_{\Omega} |DG_{\delta}(T_k(u)^q)| \leq \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty,$$

and, using Monotone Convergence Theorem, we let $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ to get

$$\int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < k\}} |Du^q| \leq \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty.$$

Lastly, we let k goes to ∞ and appealing to the Monotone Convergence Theorem once more, it works out that u^q is a bounded variation function.

Let $0 < \delta < 1$ and keeping in mind (39), we get the following bound

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} \chi_{\{u < k\} \cap \{u^{q+1} > \delta\}} |Du^{q+1}| &= (q+1) \int_{\Omega} u^q \chi_{\{u < k\} \cap \{u^{q+1} > \delta\}} |Du| \\ &\leq (q+1) \int_{\Omega} (G_{\delta}(T_k(u)^q) + \delta) |Du| \\ &\leq (q+1)(\|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p + \delta \|u\|_{BV}) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Taking limits when $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ and also when $k \rightarrow \infty$ we get

exp-1

$$(40) \quad \int_{\Omega} |Du^{q+1}| \leq (q+1) \|u^q\|_{p'} \|f\|_p < \infty,$$

that is, $u^{q+1} \in BV(\Omega)$.

To conclude, we take limits in (37) firstly when $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ and secondly when $k \rightarrow \infty$ and then we obtain

$$\int_{\Omega} |Du^q| + \int_{\Omega} u^q |Du| = \int_{\Omega} u^q f.$$

□

teo-induccion

Theorem 4.2. *Let $1 < p < N$ and let $f \in L^p(\Omega)$ be a non-negative function. Then the solution to problem (1) belongs to $BV(\Omega) \cap L^s(\Omega)$ for every $1 \leq s < \frac{Np}{N-p}$.*

Proof. Let $u \in BV(\Omega)$ denote the unique solution to problem (1). For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we will prove that $u \in L^{s_j}(\Omega)$ where

$$s_j = N' \sum_{k=0}^j \left(\frac{N'}{p'} \right)^k.$$

It should be noted that $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} s_j = N' \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{N'}{p'} \right)^k = \frac{Np}{N-p}$. Thus, proving $u \in L^{s_j}(\Omega)$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we are done.

Firstly, we choose $q = \frac{N'}{p'}$ and since $u^q \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$, we may apply Proposition 4.1 to conclude that $u^{q+1} \in BV(\Omega) \subseteq L^{N'}(\Omega)$ and therefore $u \in L^{N'(\frac{N'}{p'}+1)}(\Omega)$, that is, $u \in L^{s_1}(\Omega)$.

Assuming now that $u \in L^{s_j}(\Omega)$, we take

$$q = \frac{N'}{p'} \sum_{k=0}^j \left(\frac{N'}{p'} \right)^k.$$

By hypothesis, we already know that $u \in L^{qp'}(\Omega)$, and using Proposition 4.1 we get $u^{q+1} \in BV(\Omega) \subseteq L^{N'}(\Omega)$. Hence, $u \in L^{N'(q+1)}(\Omega) = L^{s_{j+1}}(\Omega)$. \square

Now we are ready to prove the main result of this section.

teo-regularidad

Theorem 4.3. *Let f be a non-negative function belonging to $L^p(\Omega)$ with $1 < p < N$. Then the unique solution u to problem (1) satisfies $u \in BV(\Omega) \cap L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$.*

Proof. To show that $u \in L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$, we first claim that inequality (42) below holds for every $0 < q < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}$.

If we choose $0 < q < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}$, then we have that $qp' < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p} \frac{p}{p-1} = \frac{Np}{N-p}$. Therefore, applying Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 4.1 we arrive at $u^{q+1} \in BV(\Omega)$.

Now, we use Sobolev's inequality and inequality (40) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{exp-2} \quad (41) \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{(q+1)N'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{N'}} &\leq C(p, N) \int_{\Omega} |Du^{q+1}| \\ &\leq C(p, N)(q+1)\|f\|_p \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{qp'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, since $qp' < (q+1)N'$, we can apply Hölder's inequality and we also get

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{qp'} dx \leq \left(\int_{\Omega} (u^{qp'})^{\frac{(q+1)N'}{qp'}} dx \right)^{\frac{qp'}{(q+1)N'}} |\Omega|^{1 - \frac{qp'}{(q+1)N'}}.$$

Summing up, we have

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} u^{(q+1)N'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{N'}} \leq C(p, N)(q+1)\|f\|_p \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{(q+1)N'} dx \right)^{\frac{q}{(q+1)N'}} |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{q}{(q+1)N'}},$$

that is, we have proved our claim:

$$\text{claim0} \quad (42) \quad \left(\int_{\Omega} u^{(q+1)N'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{N'}(1 - \frac{q}{q+1})} \leq C(p, N)(q+1)\|f\|_p |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{q}{(q+1)N'}}.$$

Now, let $0 < q_n < \frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}$ define a non-decreasing sequence convergent to $\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}$. Hence, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds

$$\left(\int_{\Omega} u^{(q_n+1)N'} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{N'} \frac{1}{q_n+1}} \leq C(p, N)(q_n+1)\|f\|_p |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{q_n}{(q_n+1)N'}}.$$

Thanks to Fatou's lemma, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{p(N-1)}{N-p} N'} dx &\leq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[C(p, N)(q_n+1)\|f\|_p |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p'} - \frac{q_n}{(q_n+1)N'}} \right]^{N'(q_n+1)} \\ &\leq \left[C(p, N) \frac{p(N-1)}{N-p} \|f\|_p \right]^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $u \in L^{\frac{Np}{N-p}}(\Omega)$ holds. \square

Remark 4.4. *Going back to Proposition 4.1, it follows from $u^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}} \in L^{p'}(\Omega)$ that $u^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}$ can be taken as a test function in problem (1), that is,*

$$\int_{\Omega} |D(u^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}})| + \int_{\Omega} u^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}} |Du| = \int_{\Omega} f u^{\frac{N(p-1)}{N-p}}.$$

5. EXPLICIT EXAMPLES

This section is devoted to show radial examples of solutions in a ball. These examples allow us to provide evidence that our regularity result is sharp (see Remark 5.2 below).

In the sequel, we denote by $B_R(0)$ the open ball centered at 0 and of radius R .

ej-1

Example 5.1. *Let $R > 0$, we consider problem*

ejemplo-1 (43)
$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div} \left(\frac{Du}{|Du|} \right) + |Du| = \frac{\lambda}{|x|^q} & \text{in } B_R(0), \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial B_R(0), \end{cases}$$

with $1 < q < N$ and $\lambda > 0$.

We know that solution u to problem (43) must be a non-negative function of bounded variation with no jump part and there also exists a vector field $\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{DM}^\infty(\Omega)$ with $\|\mathbf{z}\|_\infty \leq 1$ such that

cond-distribucion (44)
$$-\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z} + |Du| = \frac{\lambda}{|x|^q} \text{ in } \mathcal{D}'(\Omega),$$

$$(\mathbf{z}, DT_k(u)) = |DT_k(u)| \text{ as measures in } \Omega \text{ (for every } k > 0),$$

and

$$u|_{\partial\Omega} = 0.$$

We assume that the solution is radial, that is, $u(x) = h(|x|) = h(r)$. Moreover, in order to satisfy the Dirichlet condition, we want that $h(R) = 0$ holds. In addition, we also assume $h'(r) \leq 0$ for all $0 \leq r \leq R$.

If $h'(r) < 0$ in an interval, then the vector field is given by $\mathbf{z}(x) = \frac{h'(|x|)}{|h'(|x|)|} = -\frac{x}{|x|}$ and $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}(x) = -\frac{N-1}{|x|}$.

Therefore, equation (44) becomes

dinar (45)
$$\frac{N-1}{r} - h'(r) = \frac{\lambda}{r^q}.$$

Since we are assuming that $h'(r) < 0$, then

$$\frac{N-1}{r} - \frac{\lambda}{r^q} < 0.$$

Now, we define

$$\rho_\lambda = \left(\frac{N-1}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

Thus, if $r \leq \rho_\lambda$, then $h'(r) < 0$ may hold, and if $r > \rho_\lambda$ the solution must satisfy $h'(r) = 0$.

We assume $0 < \rho_\lambda < R$. Then, when $\rho_\lambda \leq r \leq R$ the solution to problem (43) is constant, and since we know that $h(R) = 0$ we deduce that $h(r) = 0$ for all $\rho_\lambda \leq r \leq R$.

On account of (45), if $0 \leq r < \rho_\lambda$, then solution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h(\rho_\lambda) - h(r) &= \int_r^{\rho_\lambda} h'(s) ds = \int_r^{\rho_\lambda} \left(\frac{N-1}{s} - \frac{\lambda}{s^q} \right) ds \\ &= (N-1) \log \left(\frac{\rho_\lambda}{r} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{1-q} (r^{1-q} - \rho_\lambda^{1-q}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} (N-1) \log \left(\frac{|x|}{\rho_\lambda} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{1-q} (\rho_\lambda^{1-q} - |x|^{1-q}) & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| < \rho_\lambda, \\ 0 & \text{if } \rho_\lambda < |x| \leq R. \end{cases}$$

The vector field \mathbf{z} must be identified. When $\rho_\lambda \leq r \leq R$ we know that the vector field is $\mathbf{z}(x) = -\frac{x}{|x|}$, and when $0 \leq r < \rho_\lambda$, we assume that the vector field is radial: $\mathbf{z}(x) = x \xi(|x|)$. Thus, $\operatorname{div} \mathbf{z}(x) = N \xi(|x|) + |x| \xi'(|x|)$, and equation (44) becomes

$$-(N \xi(r) + r \xi'(r)) = \frac{\lambda}{r^q}.$$

That is,

$$-r^N \xi(r) = - \int (r^N \xi(r))' dr = \int \lambda r^{N-1-q} dr = \frac{\lambda}{N-q} r^{N-q} + C,$$

for some constant C to be determinate. Then

$$\xi(r) = -\frac{\lambda}{N-q} r^{-q} - C r^{-N}.$$

Since we need a continuous vector field and we know that $\mathbf{z}(x) = -\frac{x}{\rho_\lambda}$ for x with $|x| = \rho_\lambda$, we get the following equation

$$\rho_\lambda^{-1} = \frac{\lambda}{N-q} \rho_\lambda^{-q} + C \rho_\lambda^{-N}.$$

Finally, using that $\lambda = (N-1) \rho_\lambda^{q-1}$ we deduce

$$C = \rho_\lambda^{N-1} \frac{1-q}{N-q},$$

and therefore, the vector field is given by

$$\mathbf{z}(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{x}{|x|} & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| < \rho_\lambda, \\ -\frac{x}{N-q} \left((N-1) \frac{\rho_\lambda^{q-1}}{|x|^q} + (1-q) \frac{\rho_\lambda^{N-1}}{|x|^N} \right) & \text{if } \rho_\lambda < |x| \leq R. \end{cases}$$

regul

Remark 5.2. In our Theorem 4.3 we have prove that if $f \in L^{\frac{N}{q}}(B_R(0))$, then $u \in L^{\frac{N}{q-1}}(B_R(0))$. Since $\frac{\lambda}{|x|^q} \in L^s(B_R(0))$ for all $s < \frac{N}{q}$, it follows that $u \in L^r(B_R(0))$ for all $r < \frac{N}{q-1}$. This is exactly what it is shown.

Remark 5.3. In [16, Proposition 4.4] it was proved that for any “small” datum $f \in W^{-1,\infty}(B_R(0))$, the solution to problem (1) is always trivial. Nevertheless, in our examples we always get a positive solution. This is due to the fact that the datum $f(x) = \lambda |x|^{-q}$ when $1 < q < N$ is not in the space $W^{-1,\infty}(B_R(0))$:

Let $s = N-q$, then function $v(x) = |x|^{-s} - R^{-s} \in W_0^{1,1}(B_R(0))$ since $s < N-1$. However, the product $f(x)v(x) = \lambda |x|^{-N} - f(x)R^{-s} \notin L^1(B_R(0))$. We conclude that $f \notin W^{-1,\infty}(B_R(0))$.

It may be worth comparing our example with that occurring when the datum is $\frac{\lambda}{|x|^q}$, with $0 < q < 1$. In the same way as in Example 5.1, the solution to problem (43) depends on a value

$$r_\lambda = \left(\frac{N-q}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}}.$$

When $0 < q < 1$, the solution to problem (43) is given by

$$u(x) = \begin{cases} (N-1) \log \left(\frac{r_\lambda}{R} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{1-q} (R^{1-q} - r_\lambda^{1-q}) & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| \leq r_\lambda, \\ (N-1) \log \left(\frac{|x|}{R} \right) + \frac{\lambda}{1-q} (R^{1-q} - |x|^{1-q}) & \text{if } r_\lambda < |x| \leq R, \end{cases}$$

and the vector field associated is

$$\mathbf{z}(x) = \begin{cases} -\frac{\lambda}{N-q} x |x|^{-q} & \text{if } 0 \leq |x| \leq r_\lambda, \\ -\frac{x}{|x|} & \text{if } r_\lambda < |x| \leq R. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that, since $0 < q < 1$, this solution is always bounded.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco and D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, 2000.
- [2] F. Andreu, C. Ballester, V. Caselles and J.M. Mazón, *The Dirichlet problem for the total variation flow*, J. Funct. Anal. **180** No. 2 (2001), 347–403.
- [3] G. Anzellotti, *Pairings between measures and bounded functions and compensated compactness*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **135** (1983), 293–318.
- [4] P. Bénilan, L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët, R. Gariepy, M. Pierre and J. L. Vázquez, *An L^1 theory of existence and uniqueness of solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. **22** (1995) 241–273.
- [5] L. Boccardo, T. Gallouët and L. Orsina, *Existence and uniqueness of entropy solutions for nonlinear elliptic equations with measure data*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré (Non-Linear) **13** (1996), 539–551.
- [6] H. Brezis, *Functional analysis, Sobolev spaces and partial differential equations*, Universitext. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [7] V. Caselles, *On the entropy conditions for some flux limited diffusion equations*, J. Differential Equations **250** (2011), 3311–3348.
- [8] G.-Q. Chen and H. Frid, *Divergence-measure fields and hyperbolic conservation laws*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **147** No. 2 (1999), 89–118.
- [9] M. Cicalese and C. Trombetti, *Asymptotic behaviour of solutions to p -Laplacian equation*, Asymptot. Anal. **35** (2003), 27–40.
- [10] G. Dal Maso, F. Murat, L. Orsina and A. Prignet, *Renormalized solutions of elliptic equations with general measure data* Ann. Sc. Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) **28** (1999), 741–808.
- [11] L.C. Evans, *Partial differential equations*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics **19**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1998.
- [12] L.C. Evans and R.F. Gariepy, *Measure Theory and Fine Properties of Functions*, Studies in Advanced Mathematics, CRC Press, 1992.
- [13] G. Huisken and T. Ilmanen, *The Inverse Mean Curvature Flow and the Riemannian Penrose Inequality*, J. Differential Geom. **59** (2001), 353–438.
- [14] G. Huisken and T. Ilmanen, *Higher regularity of the inverse mean curvature flow*, J. Differential Geom. **80** (2008), 433–451.
- [15] B. Kawohl, *On a family of torsional creep problems*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **410** (1990), 1–22.
- [16] M. Latorre, S. Segura de León, *Elliptic equations involving the 1-Laplacian and a total variation term with $L^{N,\infty}$ -data*, preprint.

- [17] J.M. Mazón and S. Segura de León, *The Dirichlet problem for a singular elliptic equation arising in the level set formulation of the inverse mean curvature flow*, Adv. Calc. Var. **6** (2013), 123–164.
- [18] J.M. Mazón and S. Segura de León, *A non-homogeneous elliptic problem dealing with the level set formulation of the Inverse Mean Curvature Flow*, J. Diff. Eq. **259** (2015), 2762–2806.
- [19] A. Mercaldo, S. Segura de León and C. Trombetti, *On the behaviour of the solutions to p -Laplacian equations as p goes to 1*, Publ. Mat. **52** (2008), 377–411.
- [20] A. Mercaldo, S. Segura de León and C. Trombetti, *On the solutions to 1-Laplacian equation with L^1 data*, J. Funct. Anal. **256** No. 8 (2009), 2387–2416.
- [21] R. Moser, *The inverse mean curvature flow and p -harmonic functions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **9** (2007), 77–83.
- [22] W.P. Ziemer, *Weakly differentiable functions. Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 120, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1989.

M. LATORRE: DEPARTAMENT D'ANÀLISI MATEMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA, DR. MOLINER 50, 46100 BURJASSOT, SPAIN. *E-mail address*: `marta.latorre@uv.es`

S. SEGURA DE LEÓN: DEPARTAMENT D'ANÀLISI MATEMÀTICA, UNIVERSITAT DE VALÈNCIA, DR. MOLINER 50, 46100 BURJASSOT, SPAIN. *E-mail address*: `sergio.segura@uv.es`